

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 remain in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are cancelled herein. Claims 40-68 are added herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Additionally, Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are cancelled herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 19, 21-22, 24-25, 31-33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Figure 1 of the present application (referred to herein as “Figure 1”). Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 19, 21-22, 24-25, 31-33 and 35-36 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Figure 1 since Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 19, 21-22, 24-25, 31-33 and 35-36 are cancelled herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17-18, 30, 34 and 37-39

Claims 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17-18, 30, 34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Figure 1 of the instant application in view of United States Patent Number 5,686,705 to Conroy et al. (referred to herein as “Conroy”). Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17-18, 30, 34 and 37-39 are not rendered obvious by Figure 1 in view of Conroy since Claims 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17-18, 30, 34 and 37-39 are cancelled herein.

Claims 3 and 29

Claims 3 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Figure 1 of the instant application in view of United States Patent Number 6,529,188 to Suzuki (referred to herein as “Suzuki”). Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in

Claims 3 and 29 are not rendered obvious by Figure 1 in view of Suzuki since Claims 3 and 29 are cancelled herein.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Figure 1 of the instant application in view of Conroy and further in view of Suzuki. Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 11 are not rendered obvious by Figure 1 in view of Conroy and further in view of Suzuki since Claim 11 is cancelled herein.

New Claims 40-68

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 40, which recites a display assembly for an electronic device, the display assembly comprising (emphasis added):

a display comprising a display surface and a first side, wherein said display surface and said first side are not planar;
a digitizer disposed above said display and for providing an input to said electronic device in response to a deformation of said digitizer; and
a single-piece cover disposed above said digitizer and for enabling said deformation of said digitizer in response to a contact with said single-piece cover, wherein a first portion of said single-piece cover overlaps said display surface, wherein a second portion of said single-piece cover overlaps said first side of said display, and wherein said single-piece cover comprises at least one bend joining said first and second portions and further for enabling said overlapping of said display surface and said first side of said display.

Independent Claims 49 and 59 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 41-48, 50-58 and 60-68 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single-piece cover comprises at least one bend joining said first and second portions and further for enabling said overlapping of said display surface and said first side of said display” and “wherein said display surface and said first side are not planar” as recited in independent Claim 40, and similarly recited in independent Claims 49 and 59. As recited and described in the present application, a single-piece cover (e.g., 310, 410, etc.) includes at least one bend joining a first portion of the cover (e.g., oriented horizontally in Figure 3) and a second portion of the cover (e.g., oriented vertically in Figure 3). The bend enables the cover to overlap a display surface (e.g., a top or bottom surface of the display oriented horizontally as shown in Figures 3 and 4) and a first side (e.g., a side of the displays oriented vertically as shown in Figures 3 and 4) of a display, where the display surface and the first side are not planar.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully assert that Figure 1 is directed to a cover with more than one portion. For example, Figure 1 shows touch screen assembly 100 with outer protective film 110 and supporting structure 105 (lines 11-18 of page 3 of the present application). Accordingly, Figure 1 shows a cover with *more than portion* instead of a single-piece cover as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki, either alone or in combination with Figure 1, fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single-

piece cover comprises at least one bend joining said first and second portions and further for enabling said overlapping of said display surface and said first side of said display” and “wherein said display surface and said first side are not planar” as recited in independent Claim 40, and similarly recited in independent Claims 49 and 59. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a cover *without* a bend for enabling the cover to overlap a non-planar display surface and side of the display as claimed. For example, assuming arguendo that touch panel 4 as taught by Suzuki is analogous to a cover as claimed, Suzuki teaches that that touch panel 4 does not have any bends as shown in Figure 10 of Suzuki. However, assuming arguendo that a depression of touch panel 4 creates a bend in top layer 4A of touch panel 4 (e.g., as shown in Figure 1A of Suzuki), such a bend does not enable the touch panel 4 to overlap the side of display 1 as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki, either alone or in combination with Figure 1, fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single-piece cover comprises at least one bend joining said first and second portions and further for enabling said overlapping of said display surface and said first side of said display” and “wherein said display surface and said first side are not planar” as recited in independent Claim 40, and similarly recited in independent Claims 49 and 59.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Conroy, either alone or in combination with Figure 1 and/or Suzuki, fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single-piece cover comprises at least one bend joining said first and second portions and further for enabling said overlapping of said display

surface and said first side of said display” and “wherein said display surface and said first side are not planar” as recited in independent Claim 40, and similarly recited in independent Claims 49 and 59.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claims 40, 49 and 59 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Figure 1, Suzuki and/or Conroy. Since dependent Claims 41-48, 50-58 and 60-68 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 41-48, 50-58 and 60-68 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Figure 1, Suzuki and/or Conroy. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 40-68 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 40-68 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 1 / 6 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060